

**Intelligent Transportation Systems on the
state or local network but not on the AHS or NHS*
Project Evaluation Criteria**

Prescreening Criteria					
A. Clear and complete project and operational plan definition? Yes/No	Project implementation and operation plan clearly defined. (Yes; project may proceed to B.)	Project implementation and operation plan inadequate. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A
B. Project fulfills Alaska and National ITS Architecture? Yes/No	Project is clearly defined to fully conform to Alaska and National ITS architecture. (Yes; project may proceed to C.)	Project not defined to meet Alaska and National ITS architecture. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A
C. Project will adhere to NTCIP* requirements? (unless legacy systems prevent such requirement). Yes/No	Project documentation clearly identifies all NTCIP requirements and is designed to meet them. (Yes; project may proceed to scoring.)	Vague identification of NTCIP requirements or no indication that they will be conformed to. (No; project not eligible for consideration.)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Scoring Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
1. Fosters department's mission and goals defined in ITS strategy: <i>Efficiency and reliability; safety & Homeland Security; quality of life; and, multimodal mobility.</i> Weighting: 10	Strongly supports three or more of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Strongly supports two of the key goals defined in ITS Strategy.	Support of key goals is minimal, speculative or temporary. (No; veto of project, do not score further.)	N/A	N/A
2 Enhances the department's operating budget. Weighting: 5	Project provides a significant contribution to department operating budget (>250,000)	Project provides a moderate contribution to department operating budget (\$150,000)	Project will have no or minimal effect on department budget. (\$50,000)	This project will cause the department to incur significant new costs not offset by savings, revenue or avoided costs.	N/A

*NTCIP is the "National Transportation Communications for ITS Protocols"

**Intelligent Transportation Systems on the
state or local network but not on the AHS or NHS*
Project Evaluation Criteria**

Standards	Scoring Criteria				
	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
3. Integration within department. Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies within department.	N/A	N/A
4. Integration external to department including other agencies and/or private sector. Weighting: 3	Project concept strongly integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept moderately integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	Project concept minimally integrated with other activities or ITS strategies external to department.	N/A	N/A
5. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund project development. Weighting: 3	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5% of project cost. Maximum=20.	Contribution of state match, design, right-of-way, and/or materials: 1 point per each 5% of project cost.	Contribution covers no capital costs; contributes nothing.	N/A	N/A
6. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund M&O costs. (For non-DOT or DOT unsuited to long-term ownership). Weighting: 3	Sponsor will assume ownership if currently a DOT&PF facility; or sponsor will assume ownership of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility; or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost.	Sponsor contributes nothing. Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 1 pt.; And results in significant local maintenance savings = 2 pts.	N/A	N/A
7. Magnitude of project costs including capital and operating. (Include allied projects in cost calculation.) Weighting: 5	Project cost of less than \$1 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$3 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project cost of less than \$5 million including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$5 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.	Project requires \$10 million or more including operating costs for 5 years.

**Intelligent Transportation Systems on the
state or local network but not on the AHS or NHS*
Project Evaluation Criteria**

Standards	Scoring Criteria				
	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
8. Sustainability of technology involved. Weighting: 5	Project relies on technology proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of long-term project success is very high.	Project relies on technology used but not considered proven sustainable in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project long-term project success is moderately high.	Project relies on technology yet unproven in Alaskan circumstances. Chance of project success unknown.	N/A	-N/A
9. Multi-use potential. Weighting: 5	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project significantly.	Project technology expands ITS potential beyond this project moderately.	Little or no ITS expansion potential offered by this project.	N/A	N/A
10. Time to Completion Weighting: 3	Project implementation likely <18 months.	Project implementation >18 months, but <36 months.	Project implementation >36 months.	N/A	N/A
11. Geographic benefit. Weighting: 2	Project beneficiaries in all three regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in at least two regions of state.	Project beneficiaries in only one region or community.	N/A	N/A

Total Weight = 47